

Summary of Discussion
Broward County Charter Review Commission
Administrative Issues/Governance Subcommittee Meeting
Thursday, August 30, 2007
Broward County Main Library, 8th Floor
Conference Rooms 8A-B
3:00 PM – 5:00 PM

Members Present:

Dr. Irv Rosenbaum, Chair
Burnadette Norris-Weeks, Esq. Vice Chair
Michael Buckner, Esq.
Mayor Debby Eisinger
Ms. Patricia Good
Richard Weiss, Esq. (via telephone)

Members Absent:

Bruce Rogow, Esq.

Others Attending:

Karen Boutros, Exec. Director, Broward Workshop
Angelo Castillo, Commissioner, Pembroke Pines, FL
Charles Caulkins, Fort Lauderdale, FL
Mayor Josephus Eggelation, Broward County
Chedley Etienne, Administrative Assistant, CRC
Samuel S. Goren, Esq.
Yolanda Grooms, Administrative Specialist, CRC
Maria Gross, Assistant Director, CRC
Phyllis A. King, PKING Consulting
Adam Levy, Fort Lauderdale, FL
Commissioner Ilene Lieberman, Broward County
Norm Ostrau, Esq., Chair, Florida Commission on Ethics

Hazelle Rogers, CRC Vice- Chair
Robin Rorapaugh, Hollywood, FL
Gaynel Smith, Broward Workshop
Kurt Spitzer, President of KSA, Inc.
Terry Stiles, Stiles Corporation, Broward Workshop
Heather Stone, Commissioner Jacob's Office
Wil Trower, Charter Review Commission
Patricia G. West, Executive Director, CRC

(A copy of the sign-in sheets identifying those present is filed with the supplemental papers to the summary of this Subcommittee Meeting.)

A meeting of the Broward County Charter Review Commission, Administrative Issues / Governance Subcommittee "Committee," "Subcommittee," or "AGSC," was held at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, August 30, 2007 at the Broward County Main Library, Conference Rooms 8A-B, Fort Lauderdale, FL.

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

The Chair Dr. Irv Rosenbaum called the meeting to order at 3:13 p.m. A phone call was placed to Mr. Weiss, to include him in the discussion, via conference call. The Chair requested the roll call by Phyllis A. King, PKING Consulting, Inc. Upon completion of the roll call, Mr. Goren advised for the record that *Mr. Weiss is present via telephone and as a member of the subcommittee is able to vote on any topic presented for voting.* The Chair then called for discussion of agenda item II.

II. Approval of 8/23/2007 Summary of Discussion

Mr. Buckner MOTIONED, Ms. West SECONDED.

Ms. Good requested to have this item tabled, as she had not had a chance to look through the Summary of Discussion from the last meeting. There being no objections from the subcommittee the SOD dated 8/23/2007 was tabled until the next meeting.

The Chair then introduced Angelo Castillo, a former member of the CRC, who wanted to address the subcommittee.

Mr. Castillo introduced himself to the subcommittee and told them of his background with the CRC. He commended the subcommittee for their duties, and proceeded to outline his conditions as to why he supported the concept of an Executive Mayor. He told the subcommittee about the findings of the research conducted by his staff and why this was the best avenue for them to pursue. Mr. Castillo requested that if the subcommittee decided to go with an Executive Mayor, that they insure that the Executive Mayor not be allowed to vote on the County Commission due to Sunshine Law provisions. He stated that this type of Mayor could help create consensus and then thanked the subcommittee for their time and efforts, and opened the floor to questions.

Ms. Good then asked Mr. Castillo if he saw any benefits in the issues at large.

Mr. Castillo stated he did not see what the point would be or what it would accomplish.

Ms. Weeks stated that she agreed with many of Mr. Castillo's comments and asked Mr. Castillo in reference to his comments on the studies he conducted, what kind of studies he had performed.

Mr. Castillo stated that there was significant review done at the staff level and all of their findings can be found in the library.

Mr. Buckner asked Mr. Castillo what his basis was for his belief on the Mayoral position proposal and why he felt the public was ready for something more.

Mr. Castillo said he felt that 9/11 changed everything. It was his personal belief that the people saw the need for a Mayor then and are ready for it.

Ms. Eisinger asked Mr. Castillo about his personal belief in regards to a Mayor/Commissioner form of government, and how the idea could be sold to the public this time around.

Mr. Castillo responded he thought it was a fair point, but he was not in support of a Strong Mayor but rather an Executive Mayor similar to Miami-Dade. He stated that he felt like the question the subcommittee should be asking is how much Mayor does the public need in light of the issues that they are confronted with.

Ms. Eisinger advised Mr. Castillo that as a prior member of the CRC, his opinions are important and then asked him his opinion on Commission Wasserman-Rubin supporting the possibility of voting at large, coming from certain districts.

Mr. Castillo stated he did not share the Commissioner's view. He felt like that would be deviating from the formula our Country has used for over 300 years and with that lays a multitude of risks.

Ms. Good told Mr. Castillo about the last meeting the subcommittee had, and the lengthy debate regarding diversity and how redistricting could possibly dilute the current diversity of the County. She asked him if he felt changing the composition of the districts would affect the existing diversity.

Mr. Castillo agreed that it would absolutely dilute the district diversity. He advised that he felt like 11 districts is a good number, but 13 may be too much.

Ms. Weeks asked Mr. Castillo his thoughts on her support of a Mayor that voted within a 10 single member district setting.

Mr. Castillo replied that this would result in an increase to 11 of the current system and the Mayor would not have any greater ability to represent at large than she does now. Instead, he felt like the Mayor would do better not voting, and spending time talking to colleagues to build the consensus they are going to eventually need.

The subcommittee thanked Mr. Castillo for his time and comments. The Chair then moved on to agenda item III.

III. Review of Subcommittees Issues

- a. Ethics – (Review of Resolution #2008-03- Voting Conflict Recusal, City of Los Angeles Conflict of Interest Code, Broward County Ethics Ordinance – 2007-002, CS/HB 1391**
- b. .Code of Conduct & Ethics –North Broward Hospital District)**

1. Voting Conflict Recusal

Mr. Goren read proposed Resolution 2008-003 and noted to the subcommittee the changes reflected in the document as requested at the last meeting, including the change in language in regard to a member who would not be participating in a vote due to conflicts, to not only have them leave the dais, but to leave the room where the voting will be taking place all together. He continued to cover the changes that were requested in the previous meeting, as outlined in the proposed Resolution.

Mr. Weiss advised staff that he did not have copies of the current document. A conversation ensued between Mr. Weiss and the Chair in regards to whether he was furnished a copy of the resolution.

Mr. Goren explained and read the article verbatim for Mr. Weiss, since he did not have a copy.

Ms. Rogers advised that she felt cities should be able to amend their charters and adopt similar resolutions.

Mr. Goren stated that in theory the City could adopt an ordinance of the County Charter and apply it to their city.

Ms. Rogers added that the Charter did not specify which was more restrictive and that was the issue, in her opinion, that needed to be addressed.

Ms. Eisinger agreed with Ms. Rogers. She stated that the County Charter only supersedes in certain areas and if they were to try to place a provision in the Charter that stated otherwise there would be uproar from elected officials in regard to home rule. Ms. Eisinger suggested, the subcommittee adopted the Charter and bring it before the League of Cities and ask them to suggest it to other cities.

The Chair advised the subcommittee to keep the discussion in relation to the County.

Ms. Rogers stated that there is language in the Charter that speaks to the cities, and she felt like this was a great opportunity for the subcommittee, to place in the Charter language that required for them to adopt or adhere to what is in the County Charter.

Mr. Weiss declared his reluctance on imposing requirements on cities. He agreed more with Ms. Eisinger's idea of approaching the League of Cities rather than mandating the cities to do anything.

The Chair recommended tabling this item and having a vote.

Mr. Weiss stated he would not be able to vote on this item because he did not have the revised version. He did want them to note that he felt the word *dais* should be removed altogether; he instead felt *chambers* would be more appropriate.

The subcommittee agreed to have the wording changed from **dais** to reflect **chambers** instead.

Ms. Good MOTIONED to change the language from “leaving the dais” to “leaving the chambers”, SECONDED by Ms. Eisinger and the motion passed 5 YES to 1 RECUSED.

A conversation ensued between Mr. Weiss and Ms. West concerning his not having the necessary supporting documentation for the meeting. Ms. West apologized for the error and offered to furnish Mr. Weiss copies via email. Mr. Weiss then stated he would like to be able to participate in the vote. Mr. Goren reminded him that he had already recused himself from the vote earlier. Mr. Weiss asked for the subcommittee to please refrain from proceeding until he receives the revision from Ms. West.

Mr. Goren advised the subcommittee that a vote had already been taken on the issue, and they would have to do a motion to reconsider the vote in order for Mr. Weiss' vote to be recorded.

Mr. Buckner MOTIONED to reconsider the vote, Seconded by Ms. Good approved unanimously.

The Chair tabled the motion until Mr. Weiss has the revised Resolution.

2. Governance-Non Interference

Mr. Goren stated in regards to proposed Resolution 2008-002 that the only change was the addition of the penalty section; which is the same for 2008-003 as it relates to violations. The penalties are for use against County Commissioners and subordinate personnel.

Mr. Spitzer questioned Mr. Goren in regards to the language in Exhibit A Section 2.16, which Mr. Goren clarified for the subcommittee.

The Chair voiced concern for the possible snagging of an innocent person for minor incidents as a result of the clause.

Mr. Spitzer stated he had never heard of a case of that nature and felt that this clause is important to keep the Weak Mayor from thinking he/she is a Strong Mayor.

Mr. Buckner asked for an example of what he commented on, because he felt that Section 207 revision is very clear, and wanted a better clarification.

The Chair responded to Mr. Buckner and gave an example of how something simple may be interpreted as inappropriate, and then referred to Mr. Goren for comment.

Mr. Goren stated there is a presumption in the draft and in his comment that the County Commission will do the right thing and not interfere; as they are supposed to do. He stated the revision reflected the actual active interference and does not interfere with the ordinary operations of County government. He advised the subcommittee that someone on the Commission committing a simple act would not violate, but to do that same act repeatedly and intentionally could.

The Chair stated that in his experience the non-Interference clause is violated on many occasions, but no one is ever called on it.

Ms. Rogers asked whether this rule would apply to a County Commissioner speaking directly to the County Manager. She also asked in relation to the Speaker and his comments, reference to the Sunshine Law, as well as allowing the Mayor to interact with the individual Commissioners, how they could express it in the one piece of legislation they are working on.

Mr. Spitzer replied that was not the direction he felt this subcommittee was going in and separation does not work. He did feel like the current plan for an elected or weak Mayor would allow the Mayor to be part of the Commission and not violate Sunshine Laws.

Mr. Goren cautioned the subcommittee that as they make changes, they should also be mindful that each individual section or part of the clause must be able to stand alone and deliberate. They must also be able to integrate.

Ms. Eisinger said that Section 2.07 Exhibit A does have a lot of sensitive areas and gray matter, but it specifically speaks to the fact that nothing is to be construed to prohibit other individual members from closely scrutinizing any government they speak with. She stated that although it may be difficult to determine who is right or wrong, the clause does address the situation of the subcommittee member speaking to staff to gather information, versus directing. She said she was comfortable with the wording of the clause, even if they move towards the form of elected Mayor and stated that it was the job of the County Administrator to hire and fire staff.

Mr. Spitzer commented that the term of the County Administrator is often substituted as an employee, in places where there are elected, or Executive Mayor in this clause.

Ms. Weeks stated she was in support of the resolution, however she wondered in the event they decide to go with something more along the lines of the speaker earlier, that they should wait to discuss this issue.

The Chair agreed and asked them to vote on the Resolution 2.07.

Mr. Buckner MOTIONED to approve Resolution 2008-002, SECONDED by Ms. Good. MOTION passed unanimously.

The Chair then recognized Mr. Norm Ostrau and asked if he had any information for the subcommittee.

Mr. Ostrau replied no.

The Chair called a 5-minute recess to give staff time to get documentation forwarded to Mr. Weiss.

[The meeting reconvened at 4:17 pm]

The Chair then moved on to next order of business.

c. Structure/Form of Government

Mr. Goren gave an overview of Resolution 2008-004 and its 3 alternate proposals. He stated the objective of each proposal was to provide a mechanism of transition and provided the subcommittee with comprehensive examples of each proposal, and scenarios each proposal could create. He also commented on the Totality of Circumstances Test which deals with voter delusion and issues which courts can look at, and how anything that this Board does will be judged based on that test by law. He added, by compressing or increasing districts or by adding At-large districts that were not there previously, creates new challenges. Mr. Goren advised the subcommittee to consider that as well.

Ms. Weeks asked Mr. Goren what kind of challenges he could foresee in increasing districts.

Mr. Goren responded that by keeping the districts as they are there may be no impact.

Ms. Weeks asked if the real concern was diluting minority representation or the district structure.

Mr. Goren replied that the compression of districts opens the doors to other issues that would require review.

Mr. Weiss reminded the subcommittee that the CRC is not who will draw the districts and the County Commission cannot modify, only vote up or down. He recommended possibly adding some criteria to guide them. They will always be bound by Federal Law and the districts must be as nearly equal in population as is practical, they must be mindful not to dilute minority voting strength, but you can recognize a variety of other factors such as party affiliation and natural boundaries. You want to avoid bizarre shapes, splitting neighborhoods and municipal boundaries. He also commented on Alternate 4, with the 6-1-2 plan, they can add the requirement of residency.

The Chair stated that the issues for them to address now was the compression and minority representation issue.

Ms. Good requested for an explanation of the 5 options for clarification.

Mr. Goren provided clarification on Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, which he explained ; each essentially provides for compression from 9 single member districts to 8 independent single member districts with a Mayor At-large, with the difference between the three being staggered voting and when the Mayor becomes electable.

Ms. Eisinger asked if Alternates 1 and 2 would leave all Commission members with a full 4-year term.

Mr. Goren replied yes.

Ms. Good expressed concern that decreasing the Commission districts would definitely impact those findings. She stated although she does want a large number to provide additional representation to the community, she does not want to impede on the present diversity.

Ms. Weeks advised that she is in support of Option.5.

Mr. Buckner stated his position of being in agreement with both Ms. Good and Ms. Weeks in regard to minority representation. He felt that the totality of circumstances a court would look at had not been

addressed. Besides total population, he felt voting age, racial language minority groups, and voter registration of minority groups were other areas that needed to be focused on based on the research he conducted. He stated in Federal Court, there only needs to be a 65% minority group in order to be considered as an established majority-minority district. His primary concern is having any type of at large districts, because it will dilute the minority population.

Mr. Weiss agreed with everything Mr. Buckner said and added that his concern was parochialism and the protection of minority representation. He asked Mr. Buckner how they should deal with the parochialism issue, at the same time as acknowledging the issue regarding re-districting.

Mr. Buckner responded that parochialism existed at the State and Federal levels so he did not view it as a necessary problem. He felt that State Representatives are there to represent the interest of their particular district, and so the same should apply to the County Commission.

Mr. Weiss responded to Mr. Buckner by asking if he had absolutely no concern in regards to parochialism and the problem that exists in the situation he gave regarding no support.

Mr. Buckner said he felt changing to single member districts would be a start in the right direction, along with the increase in voter registration among minorities and language population. Having at-large seats would not help the problem, but instead it would dilute the affect that was achieved in 2000 when they switched to single-member districts.

Ms. Eisinger advised the subcommittee that she would not support any proposal that increases the Commission representation.

Ms. Weeks stated that everyone has deviated from their original position in some form or another as a result of educating themselves on the issues. On the matter of fair and equal representation, she asked how better to accomplish this goal than by having more districts with smaller populations. Ms. Weeks stated that she was in agreement with Mr. Buckner, and that she was not opposed to a Strong Mayor, but she did not feel that was the consensus of the subcommittee. She advised that by giving the Mayor more power than what the Charter provides would help create some balance. 10 districts would alleviate the issues they were looking at and she was not opposed to going back and looking at a Mayor with more power than the Mayor has now.

Ms. Good asked if there was a residency requirement attached to at-large member districts, and if this would address the minority representation concerns that have been raised.

Mr. Buckner replied no; because minority groups do not have the voting strength they would need to elect someone of their choosing. It would be a County-wide election despite it being for that particular district, and there is no minority voting strength in the County as a whole.

The Chair introduced guest speaker Mayor Josephus Eggleton.

Mayor Eggleton: Let me just apologize in advance. I do not know what you have been discussing in detail, I did see Mr. Rosenbaum the other evening and he told me you would be discussing some of these things. After my discussion with Mr. Rosenbaum, I was able to go and get some statistical data. One of the things I do know, that is when you start talking about districts and redrawing lines, at the end of the day when you go to court, if you do not have the definitive evidence to support your position, you're going to be defeated. Let me start off by making this real clear; I am a very strong proponent of single-member districts. The Congress is made up of single-member districts, so is the Legislature. I believe that single-member districts give all people the fairest opportunity for representation in an elected body. If an at-large system was so good, then how come you only have less than 7 women in the US Senate where you literally have an at-large election system statewide? It is very hard for minorities, and I include women as a minority, to get elected in an at-large system...period. Court case after court case has confirmed this. If there is an issue placed on the ballot that would cause the dilution of the minority voting strength, I will personally take my own money as I did in 2000 and sue the County and I know I will win.

Let me remind you, as I have before, that you now have a new protected class in Broward County. Hispanics are a protected class and if you ever want to know the impact of that you need to ask the County Commissioners in Osceola County. They went through the same thing you are going through now and got their butts kicked by trying to play with that protected class. Let me remind you, they were only made a protected class last year by a conservative Justice Department. So, if a conservative Justice Department makes Hispanics in this County a protected class, it ultimately tells you where you are going to stand when you go to court. It is going to be the Justice Department that will first review that case going forward.

Having said that, Broward County has about 955,379 registered voters; by the way when you go to Court they tend to discount population and what they look at mostly is your VAP (Voting Age

Population) not that total population. The second thing they look at is what does the voter registration data suggest. Broward County census estimate suggested Broward County is 51% minority, made up of a large plethora of ethnic minorities most of which are not even citizens. So if you go on population data you will find yourself in a pickle because the courts do not rely heavily on population data as much as they do voter age population and ethnicity. Let me just say, I still believe our elections are still partisan in this County, that means you bring in Republican, Democrats, and Independents, so you need to be careful that a political party does not sue you? Of the almost million voters, the total aggregate number of minority voters is only 31%. When you segregate those numbers, black voters make up 18.7% and Hispanics 12.6% of the vote. If you think those numbers will get you elected, without single member districts, you are fooling yourself. Any attempts to shrink the number of districts clearly will be viewed by the court as a dilution of minority voting strength, and they are not going to stand for it. Broward County just got away from County-wide elections and in the history of this County there have only been 4 minorities elected. This is why the legislature forced them to go to single member seats because there were not any minorities on the Board of County Commissioners. The issue is not only can they win the election but rather can they sustain it over a period of time, and in this County you cannot.

The problem with doing reviews intermittently is you do not have good data. The data repository for the State of Florida census data is at the University of Florida. It is not in the County's utility department. You are not going to have good reliable data to do that. If you were to go to Broward County Utility Department and ask how many utility hook-ups you have, they are only going to tell you the amount by household. But what's the voting age population of those utility hook-ups. What does VAP data suggest and say in the long run, where is the information to sustain what you are going to do and to justify and to defend you, the trial review commission, in a court suit? It is simply not there. When you start looking at the current districts we have today, if you want to look at an imbalance in districts, my district is probably the most non-registered voters. My district has 86,000 registered voters, while Diane Wasserman-Rubin has 123,000 and Ms. Lieberman has 97,000 registered voters. The rest of the districts are within the standard deviation that the courts usually allow for local governments. The courts usually allow 10% standard deviation in local districts as opposed to no deviation on statewide and federal districts. The deviation in the voting age population is well within what the courts generally allow. One thing I am saying to you is, what we are doing in Broward County is brand new. It only got started in 2000 and if you keep tinkering with it, it will never have the opportunity to mesh itself into a system that works.

I looked at some of your alternatives such as an elected Mayor and that is fine, but understand I am currently the Mayor. My dad told me Sunday, "son everybody loves to ride a free horse." I find myself all over the County representing the County as a figure head; but I do not have any more authority or power than another elected member of that body. It gives me the authority to place items on the agenda but it also gives every Commissioner that same authority. So if you are talking about a Countywide Mayor but you do not clearly expand the powers of the Mayor, you have nothing more than what you have today which is a Mayor by rotation; it makes no sense. If you're going to have a Mayor, give him some real power and authority. I have always believed and said so, that Broward County needs a Strong Mayor. Any large urban County our size almost anywhere in America has a Strong Mayor. You've got to have 1 person in charge.

Here's what happens at the Broward County Board of Commissioners and it happens often. When things go bad it is always the other person, it is never the Board of County Commissioners. Many times we are the problem, me included. We protect ourselves and point the finger at the other person, because we don't ever want to be wrong and that's not right. If you have a Strong Mayor, you know where the buck stops. You could do that in any shape, form, or fashion that you want and say we have a County Administrator, a trained person to run this County. How many times do we have to continually change Administrators before people get it right? The bottom line is to allow the system to work, if it is not broke, why fix it.

I heard the comments that the County Commission is too parochial. Can someone cite to me some instances of parochialism? If you don't think I'm going to be interested in the welfare of my district, why have single member districts...period. I'm going to do that but I'm just as interested in the people in Hallandale, Miramar, in Deerfield Beach and elsewhere. I support the issues in those areas as well. People come to me to lobby for those areas all the time. For example, Sue Gunzburger fought hard on the Gulfstream Park project, and was out voted by members of the County Commission. If we were so parochial and were not looking out for the issues of everyone then we would have allowed Gunzburger to prevail. There is an issue that is coming to the Board, Ms. Eisinger that may affect your city; a huge development, and I am sure you know what I am talking about; the jury is still out on that. I generally vote for those things I feel is in the best interest of Broward County, the airport is an excellent example. The 2 district Commissioners where the airport falls were firmly against expansion of the airport, but the Board looking out for the best interest of the County, felt that it was important to allow for the expansion of the airport, and that's what happens.

The last thing I want to say is the Board is evolving into a regional governing authority. Meaning that we look at the big picture; regional issues, transportation, water and sewer, bus transit, libraries and things like that. We are very content to allow local municipalities to take care of local municipal needs, and we take care of the large picture needs that this County so very badly needs. There are many more statistics I could give, but the main thing I want you to know is that I am very serious what I said about the lawsuit. All it takes is one person from the protected class to file a lawsuit and here is what the courts are going to tell you. The Courts are going to say before you draw one seat, you must draw a seat that will elect a Hispanic. That is why so many of these districts are weird, odd shaped, because you have to take care of the protected class first. Those are the first districts you draw. Anytime you move one population, you have to move several others to balance it out. The smart thing to do with districting is to let it take place after a decennial census, so you can have good, hard data. If you do it prior to that, you won't have good data and will only invite a lawsuit that way. Thank you.

Mr. Buckner MOTIONED, Ms. Good SECONDED and the MOTION passed unanimously to extend the meeting.

c. Regionalism

d. Economic Development

IV. Public Comment

Public Speaker – Terry Stiles

Mr. Stiles: My name is Terry Stiles, I represent Stiles Corporation. I have been a citizen here since 1950. I also represent the Broward Workshop. I agree with Joe as far as a Single-member district, we have to protect the minority vote, but, I also think that we have to do something – as Joe said. If it is a Strong Mayor solution, that's what we need to go after. We need to have a voice that is giving some County-wide representation on areas of regionalism. I know Joe talked about the Airport, but the Airport was a huge fight and a lot of it was because of a focused Commissioner that had to protect his constituency, which I respect. But we need somebody with – and I wish Joe could be a Mayor for a longer period of time; he stepped up to the plate and took on some regional issues. We need somebody that will direct the effort – and our solution from the Workshop – because we don't want to change the districts. Our solution was to add a Mayor and a Vice Mayor, and have those two people run At-large. I am not into the minority dilution because I do not quite understand it and I learned more today than I've learned in a long time. We need to have that cross County representation and other

issues so we can go before the State and have that County representation to set the agenda and be a stronger County for everybody's benefit including the minorities. This is One County – when you look at huge areas like our Seaport and our Airport and our Transportation, we need somebody that focuses on those issues not just what's going in their district.

Public Speaker - Alan Levy

Mr. Levy: My name is Alan Levy and I have been a resident of Broward County since 1942, so I've seen a lot of changes and I have seen a lot of things happen. I have seen a lot of Charter Review Commissions act and react; sometimes a lot of work goes down the drain, but I don't think that's the case here. I think that we have matured as a County into a different position than we have ever been. You know what the real strength of Broward County is right now – the 31 Cities that are in Broward County, that's the strength. That is the most impressive thing that I have seen. I am currently chairing the United Way Campaign; it is giving me the opportunity to get out and visit the Cities of Broward County. Believe me this is something that 10 years ago, 5 years ago, no one would have even thought about doing because everything was sort of Fort Lauderdale. Fort Lauderdale is not the strength, the strength is in these magnificent Cities that are so well governed and so well maintained that – that is where your strength is happening. So like the Mayor just pointed out – the County Commission is in the business of doing what the Cities cannot afford to do that is sharing. Who is going to build the roads that connect the Cities? Who is going to deal with Transportation? Who is going to deal with water and sewer and all the issues that the Cities cannot do or in many cases the Cities are doing? I want to tell you something – this is a great County and the people deserve to be well represented.

My only argument with the Mayor is that we do have a Single-member district and an At-large district type of government in the State and the Federal government and it is called the Senate. The Senate is your At-large person, so at least there is somebody that is looking at the whole picture. Although I favored Single-member districts for representation that it gives me, I have seen many abuses of it. So there is a balance – I think all we are looking for is a balance. I think you have to have fair, equitable representation for all the people that live in Broward County so there is an ability to go to the representative. I also like to think that those of us who want to talk about the whole picture and the efforts of the Broward Workshop have been Broward County. We would like to think that there is somewhere we can go to for representing the whole County – somebody that has that constituency in mind when they're acting. Now the School Board is the perfect example – there are Single-member districts and there is At-large and there's a balance. That At-large elected school board member tends to keep things in a modern way, sometimes it causes some disadvantaged arguments and debate but

the debate is what it is all about; that's what we are here doing today. I am just suggesting a Strong Mayor – it's just two words, I don't know what it means – I think a Mayor that has some authority to act as leader is very important. I think there should be some defined responsibilities given to the Mayor so that Mayor can act in that role. I want to suggest that there is some way that we have at least 1 or 2 At-large people, and the Mayor could be either one of them and maybe someone else. Somebody we can talk to, somebody that could interact with the leaders of the community and sort of work with that Single-member district person to try to come to a solution.

Thank you all for what you are doing, I have enjoyed coming to the meetings – it's been really interesting and I hope that we come up with some consensus here that is a balance. Thank you.

Ms. Weeks thanked Mayor Eggelton for his comments. She referred to section 203 of the Voting Rights Act. When lines are drawn again, the minority representation will be looked at a lot more critically than it was before and that is a huge issue. She expressed concerned with what is happening now with term limits and that there are a lot of people who cycle around to different positions in the County. Ms. Weeks stated that she would be opposed to any proposal that would come out of the subcommittee that would include At-large seats. She again recommended that the subcommittee consider alternate number 5.

Mr. Buckner stated that if the subcommittee were to include At-large districts, they would have to include in the record an expert testimony or an analysis indicating that there would be voting discrepancy. He stated that he believes that the subcommittee will do a disservice and open the subcommittee to legal scrutiny. Mr. Buckner expressed concern with not wanting Broward County to be one of those Counties under the Voting Rights Act that has to pre-clear our voting plans with the Department of Justice. He does not want to reverse where Broward County is going and wishes to go forth. Mr. Buckner recommended keeping the 9 Single-member districts and having an Elected Executive but still retain a Professional Manager.

Mr. Weiss advised that he does not wish to waste a lot of time and that he believes the Mayor means what he says. He stated that the subcommittee would be doing a great disservice to the voters to put something on the ballot that is subject to a legal challenge. Mr. Weiss stated that he agrees with Mr. Buckner and requested analysis by legal counsel. He would like to know that the subcommittee is proposing something that is legally sustainable.

The Chair advised that would be the case in any proposal that the subcommittee would pass.

Mr. Weiss stated that he would like to know where the subcommittee stands as of now.

Ms. Rogers asked Mayor Eggelletion how someone achieves protected class status other than going through the courts and having it challenged.

Ms. Good interjected and advised that she appreciates the testimony that was given today by the guest speakers. That in reviewing the various options that have been presented, alternates 1- 5 based on the comments made by subcommittee members, some of the alternatives can be done away with.

The Chair advised that someone would have to make a motion and it be seconded in favor of one of the alternatives and then the subcommittee could dispense the rest.

Mr. Weiss advised that he will vote no on every alternative until the subcommittee's legal counsel and consultant advises the subcommittee if the alternatives are legally defensible.

Ms. Weeks stated that she believes that is unfair to Mr. Goren, and there will probably be a challenge no matter what happens.

Mr. Weiss stated that lawyers give opinions all the time which they are paid to give and he believes his request from legal counsel is a reasonable request.

Mr. Buckner advised that he does not believe that Mr. Goren has enough information to provide a legal analysis to the proposals because the subcommittee does not have the expert analysis.

Mr. Weiss agreed with Mr. Buckner.

Mr. Spitzer: We have this map from 2000 which is called "Population Density by race and Ethnicity by Census Block: Broward County" – However, to really do a good analysis you must get behind this picture and look at the data and that will take some time. After that process is over, remember it is the County Commissioners or an independent university, if your amendment passes, who is actually going to be drawing these lines not the Charter Review Commission.

Mr. Buckner stated that the subcommittee needs some type of expert or an analysis of data suggesting that the majority-minority population of Broward County would still want to vote no matter what type of minority status or majority status exists.

Mr. Spitzer advised that the subcommittee must look at the data.

Ms. Eisinger asked if the School Board has been contested.

Ms. West advised that she spoke with Mr. Marco as directed, she added that he went to the Florida Statutes which tells exactly how the School Board is suppose to arrange their districts. She stated that he did mention that the outcome was that they left their 7 Single-member districts as they were and added 2 At-large seats that allowed the people to keep their seats, which elevated problems for the School Board.

Ms. Eisinger advised that she supports the need for minority representation.

The Chair called for a 10 minute break at 5:35 p.m.

[The Chair reconvened the meeting at 5:45 p.m.]

The Chair suggested that the best thing to do at this point would be to allow legal counsel time for research.

Ms. Rogers MOTIONED to have an alternative to maintain the 9 Single-member districts with an Elected Mayor with specific duties.

Mr. Buckner stated that he is concerned that if there is a County-wide Elected Executive who still sits with the County Commission, this would still go toward voter dilution. He added that the proposed Mayor still only has one vote on the County Commission.

Mr. Spitzer: Typically with what you were speaking of is the Elected Executive form where especially if you wanted to keep 9 an odd number Legislative body, the Mayor would not sit with that body and would be part of that body. It would be like Tampa or Jacksonville, Duval County where the Mayor is completely separate, could be with or without a professional manager however, the County Commission is a separate Legislative body and the Mayor is not part of that body – that is one way to craft that.

Mr. Buckner suggested that the Elected Executive could chair the County Commission meetings but not have a vote.

Mr. Spitzer: There are a couple of places that have done that. That is sort of unusual and I don't know how that affects the Sunshine Law directly. Fort Meyers did that, they just got rid of that system where

there were an odd number of City Counsel people, but the Mayor was head of the Executive branch but sat with and chaired the meetings and did not vote.

The Chair advised that he believes that is a question that needs to be researched. He added that the subcommittee will give Mr. Goren 2 alternatives to be researched.

Ms. Good asked if there should be a vote on the alternatives.

The Chair stated that he does not believe every one of the alternatives should be researched.

Ms. Weeks asked for clarification.

A general conversation ensued.

Ms. Eisinger advised that the subcommittee needs a fiscal impact included in the subcommittee folders.

Ms. West asked the subcommittee to provide staff with some alternatives to present.

The Chair suggested that the legal counsel research that issue as well.

Ms. Roger's MOTION was SECONDED by Mr. Bucker for discussion.

Ms. Weeks again suggested that the subcommittee look at alternate number 5 because she is not sure if the subcommittee agreed to make that a Strong Mayor. She also suggested that there be a Strong Mayor or another district seat.

Ms. Rogers stated that there are 2 options that the subcommittee could vote on today.

Mr. Spitzer: By definition that is a Strong Executive Mayor.

The Chair advised that the first alternative is to have 9 members plus the Elected Mayor.

Mr. Weiss asked if the Mayor would have specified duties.

Ms. Rogers replied yes.

Mr. Spitzer: In the Charter we have to specify several different duties for the Mayor and most of the duties that are a combination of the Mayor's office now. You would take most of the duties given to the County Administrator and that would go with the Mayor.

Mr. Weiss stated that the subcommittee has not decided any of the duties; this person could have duties which are exactly the same as our current Mayor.

Mr. Spitzer: If the County-wide Mayor's position had the duties of the existing Mayor's office but is elected for a 4 year term County-wide that would most logically form as a part of the County Commission. You would have 8 or 10 district seats plus the County-wide seat, but the duties of that office would still be as Chair of the County Commission. You would call that position the Mayor but most commonly would not have the power to hire and fire staff, propose budget, or veto powers.

Ms. Weeks advised Ms. Rogers that her vote needs to be a Strong Mayor in order for it to make sense.

Mr. Weiss advised that he would like to know the powers the proposed Mayor is going to have.

Ms. Rogers suggested that the subcommittee define the duties after.

Mr. Weiss advised that he is not going to vote for a Mayor without knowing the duties.

Ms. Weeks stated that the proposed Mayor would have control over the staff, the ability to hire and fire the Administrator, be able to set the agenda, be able to propose the budget, and also discuss and build consensus among the Commissioners.

Mr. Weiss asked if this is a true Strong Mayor that the subcommittee is proposing.

Ms. Weeks stated similar to Miami-Dade's Mayor.

Mr. Weiss advised that Miami-Dade does not have a true Strong Mayor.

Mr. Spitzer: What you would want to do is, the Mayor proposes the budget, gives the State of the County Address, hires and fires staff, hires the County Administrator, can terminate the County Administrator unilaterally, would have veto powers, give the power to override a veto by a 2/3 vote, and it would be truly a ceremonial head of the County.

Mayor Eggelletion: I just want to say you know – in the real world here is what happens in Dade County. I have a lot of close friends in Dade County on the Board of County Commissioners. They sort of dislike the system that they have today but for only one reason, and that is because they never liked Alvarez to begin with so that is why they dislike it.

Now as you pointed out Jacksonville and Tampa has that exact same system. If I remember the debate the last time, back in 2000, where we lost that vote 51 to 49, here is what some of the rub was with the Commission. They felt that the Mayor that we had which really was not an Executive Mayor, had too much authority. Really, what we did was we just stripped the authority of the Administrator that the current Administrator has today; and simply gave that to the Mayor. So if you want to say that the Mayor was too powerful then, is the Administrator too powerful? Today over at the Board of County Commissioners I only hire 3 people. I hire the Auditor, the County Attorney, and the Administrator. One of the things that you may want to do under the system to keep peace with the current Board is we would allow the Board to hire the Administrator with the Administrator then reporting to the Mayor under a Strong Mayor system. They would have the authority to hire – and that keeps down the friction like you have in Miami-Dade County. The Administrator becomes sort of the person that runs County Government day to day. The Mayor certainly would have to have the ability to hire and fire department heads; there is no question about it. Otherwise, you know you really don't have a Strong Mayor. You may have a hybrid thereof; you would still give the Commission the authority to hire the Auditor, hire the Attorney, and hire the Administrator, but the Administrator then works for the Mayor. The Mayor needs some sort of veto authority, otherwise the Mayor just really has no power whatsoever; he just becomes another voting member. You could override the veto rather in a 2/3 vote, you could simply say – with a simple majority vote. A lot of the Mayors' probably won't like that, but by the same token it brings the Commission back into the picture and it gives them a little more check on the Mayor's authority as opposed to 2/3 vote or a simple majority vote.

The other issue is the Mayor should run County-wide. There is no question about it and that would somehow, I believe, help alleviate any fears that you are going to have from the Board that all of their powers are going to be diluted somewhat. It is easier to get 5 or 6 votes in this particular case. If you go to 10 and a Mayor or 9 and a Mayor, you would need 5 as opposed to getting 2/3 of that. I think that you won't find as much opposition from the current board – if I remember the debates that we had the last time, most of the debates centered on the fact that the Mayor could hire and fire the Administrator at will and it would take 2/3 of the Board to turn any decision of that person. So if you remove those 2 obstacles, the County still would be run by a professional that is trained professionally to do that at the Mayor's discretion. The Mayor could not fire the Administrator only the County Commission could, which would be a check on the Mayor's authority per say.

Ms. Weeks stated that what the Mayor is proposing may appease the members of the County Commission; she added that it could also set up a real dilemma for the operation of the County Commission because the County Administrator could ignore the Mayor's wishes.

Mr. Spitzer: The argument for this model is a clear definition of who is in charge.

The Chair stated that if Broward County becomes a regional government the County would need some type of an elected Mayor and an elected Executive. He added that the County is not a municipality; Broward County has had a process over the past 30 years of moving away from being a municipality, and there is only a tiny area left of the unincorporated area in Broward County. He expressed his concern about a powerful elected Mayor that is more political to do municipal stuff, than more politically attractive things. The Chair advised that he agrees with Mr. Buckner's ideas, and added that he does not think the County government needs to focus on the regional issues. He stated that he does not want the County to be a municipality, and that the municipal business needs to get out the County, so Broward County can be a regional government. He would be able to support the resolution if the County government Mayor were a regional governor, a County-wide government with more policy orientation and less municipal administrative orientation. The Chair added that structure is very important; he does not want to create a powerful Mayor with municipal infrastructure.

Ms. Rogers referred to a previous meeting where the subcommittees were to create a list of the priorities of what the subcommittee believes should be listed in the Charter.

The Chair asked that Mr. Goren restate the motion.

Mr. Goren: The motion that was offered essentially provides 9 Single-member districts which is what you currently have with a Mayor elected At-large – the specific duties of which are not exactly clear at the moment but the motion has offered to provide for specific or enhanced duties, not specifically strong or weak but just enhanced duties, and that was not clarified. There was an exchange given among the members with regard to an Executive Mayor and whether that was the intention or not.

Mr. Spitzer: The duties for the Mayor or Elected officials would be to propose the budget, give the State of the County address, hire and fire staff, hire the County Administrator, can terminate the County Administrator unilaterally, would have veto powers, and be give the power to override a veto by a 2/3 vote; it would be truly a ceremonial head of the County.

Mr. Buckner SECONDED amending Ms. Rogers' MOTION to add duties specified by Mr. Spitzer as the Mayoral Position from Tampa, Jacksonville/Duval County.

Mr. Weiss stated his view of the issues for the record and added that he would not be in favor of either resolution at all. He explained with respect to the Strong Mayor form of government being proposed that he is concerned about putting that kind of power in one person.

Ms. Eisinger agreed with Mr. Weiss.

Ms. Good asked if the Strong Mayor would be a non-voting member of the Board.

Mr. Goren: That was the motion reflected in my notes.

The Chair requested a roll call vote on the motion.

The MOTION FAILED 3 Yes to 4 No.

Ms. Weeks advised that she wishes to motion option number 5, which is the same Mayor we have now, the Executive Mayor with 10 Single-member districts.

Mr. Weiss clarified Ms. Week's motion which is suggesting that the existing 9 County Commission would be expanded to 10 and that there would be a Mayor elected County-wide, who would have the duties of the Mayor currently in the Charter.

Mr. Goren: For the record alternate 5 as drafted reflects that direction.

The Chair advised the subcommittee that they are voting to give alternate 5 to general counsel for research.

Ms. Weeks MOTIONED to approve alternate 5 where the Mayor would be elected County-wide; with the same responsibilities and duties as the current Charter provides and there would be 10 Single-member districts, SECONDED by Mr. Buckner.

Mr. Weiss advised that he wished to have a discussion.

The Chair called for discussion.

Mr. Weiss stated that he is going to vote against alternate 5, because he does not want to expand the government. He added that he feels that going from 9 to 11 County Commissioners would create more bureaucracy; he does not think it accomplishes anything because the Mayor has no more powers than the Mayor has now.

Ms. Eisinger stated that she agreed with Mr. Weiss; she is not willing to expand the number on the Commission.

The Chair called for a roll call vote.

The MOTION FAILED 2 Yes to 5 No.

Ms. Eisinger MOTIONED, Ms. Good SECONDED that the AGSC subcommittee go back to one of their original proposals which is to reduce the districts to 8 Single-member districts with 1 Mayor At-large.

The Chair called for discussion.

Ms. Weeks advised that she believes Mr. Goren started the meeting appropriately with giving the subcommittee alternates that might not be appropriate. She does not foresee voting on alternatives 1, 2, or 3. The subcommittee does not agree with 4 or 5, someone needs to come back to the table with something else.

Mr. Weiss stated that if people vote in favor of this, Mr. Goren would tell the subcommittee whether it is legal or not.

The Chair called for a roll call vote.

The MOTION FAILED 2 Yes to 5 No.

Ms. Good MOTIONED to dispense of alternate 4. Ms. Weeks SECONDED and the MOTION passed unanimously.

Ms. Good advised that there was a discussion with the possibility of changing the Charter to allow the Mayor to last more than 1 year but not longer than 2 years, she asked the subcommittee if they wish to have a discussion on the issue.

A brief conversation ensued.

Mr. Weiss advised that the current Charter says that the election of the Mayor shall occur on an annual basis which the Mayor can serve consecutive terms.

Ms. Eisinger MOTIONED, Ms. Good SECONDED and the motion passed unanimously that the subcommittee consider a longer term for Mayor.

The Chair advised the AGSC has no recommendations at this time for the Structure form government.

Mr. Buckner stated that the Administrative Issues / Governance Committee is failing to provide a vision for Broward County in terms of increasing the Mayor's duties. He stated that he believes that in the long run, it is going to impact how the 3 major areas of County government operate. He added that it is unfortunate that the AGSC weren't able to come to some kind of consensus.

Mr. Spitzer: I heard this debate at the last meeting and one of the things that you all have not discussed is a system like Orange County. Where the Mayor has broad powers to hire and fire staff in the County, but as a check against the Mayor he sits with, chairs, and participates with the County Commission each time the County Commission meets. It is a move from the true Elected Executive form of government, where the Executive Branch head is not quite as powerful as that in Tampa, Jacksonville/Duval.

The Chair advised the subcommittee that there are 2 options on the table. (1) The subcommittee could have another discussion. (2) The subcommittee could pass it back to the full Charter Review Committee and discuss the issue then.

Commissioner Lieberman: I wanted to speak to you because there are a number of things on your agenda which came out of the subcommittee that I Chaired for Management and Efficiency, the Governance subcommittee. The first issue I wanted to talk to you about is that we passed on to you and charged you with looking at the fact that Broward County is a very mobile community. People move a lot in our County and we are a growth community. Because of that, currently the way in which the districts are drawn is every 10 years after the decennial census. We get numbers and the Board of County Commissioners looks at the district seats and redraws the district seats. Now we do them, twice once after the first time Single-member districts passed and again after the mid-decennial census; they are actually drawn twice in a course of about 2 years. What we saw when I chaired the Governance subcommittee was that the districts do not grow evenly. What that means is, though we started with all the right intentions, when we drew the districts, we literally divided the County population by 9 and figured as long as the district was no less than 5% of that average number or 5% or more, we had made them roughly proportionate and had done our job. Well, unfortunately the residents did not follow suit.

The Developers built more in some districts and people moved more in other districts, so that when you look at today in 2007, you actually have one of the County Commission districts which is close to 40% larger than any other County Commission district. We are in 2007; you will not be getting the 2010 decennial numbers before the 2010 elections. You will be getting them in 2011 for redistricting in 2012. So half of the decennial is gone and already you have a problem with at least 1 and possibly a

second County Commission district being pretty far above where your average would be for Broward County if you simply looked at the other 7 to 8 districts. Redistricting in and of itself is very labor intensive. You have to get data and it requires quite a bit of effort. We were concerned if within a period of 5 years, the district population could change that much if it diluted the one person one vote standard because you had a district so much larger than any other district.

In the same period of time that federal courts have subsequently ruled that the decennial census is not a limitation, it is a 10 year requirement. What the courts have said – and you are a very fine attorney who actually researched this matter for us (addressing Mr. Goren), I am just quoting back to you what he told us. Based on the recent cases that unless it says you shall redistrict every 10 and not in any other time, then it is not a limitation it is a requirement at 10 years; but it does not mean you cannot do it at 5. It does not mean you cannot do it at 2, it does not mean you cannot do it at 7 and I am not suggesting any of those numbers. What we did is we identified a problem. We have a County that does not grow evenly in the districts and if you wait the full 10 years, you have a problem with the one person, one vote standard. You have a district that is significantly larger 5 years out from the initial redistricting in 200,2 and who knows where it would be 5 years from now, it could be even worse. So we suggested to you that you look at whether there is a methodology not to do a whole scale redistricting because it takes a lot to do that; a way to adjust districts so that you bring them back into rough proportionality, and the one person one vote standard on the mid-decennial census.

Toward that I guess – and I do not want this to sound like it is going to sound – I do not know whether I had the pleasure or the obligation to serve on the National Census Committee and to have chaired Florida's 2000 Census. What I learned by serving on the National Committee for many years is that the federal government is not relying on the decennial census anymore for its most important decisions. Instead we are relying on the American Community Survey (ACS) which is a rolling census, because they now realize that America moves. Very few people are born; go to school, work, retire, and pass away in the same community. In fact mobility is what we are all about. Some of you may have noticed we don't use the long form anymore. The 2010 census is not using the long form that we used in the past instead the long form information is a rolling census that is done over the 10 years with someone on a data team. So all of the perceptions that we all have about the decennial census are not shared by the Census Bureau and certainly are not shared by the federal courts who have now said that unless it says, you shall at no other time. It simply sets a time that you must do it, but does not prohibit you from doing it at any other time.

So we charged you to look at what is going on to see if there is some way that we can look at those mid-decennial numbers, and if a district looks more out of whack than somebody else's, then there is a way to go back to that. To sort of spread the population around so that you bring them back into whatever would be a reasonable range of numbers. Certainly I think we would all agree that one district, 40% larger than another 5 years out, seems a bit grossly disproportional.

The second thing that we looked at had to do with a little bit of what you talked about with the Airport and the Seaport. We actually had Mel Wilson's firm work for us and do an analysis of whether there was synergy by merging certain parts of the Airport functions. If you were to say to me, what's my vision for the future – I do not think it will happen while I am County Commissioner. I do believe at some point you will see them merging the 3 Airports, the 3 Seaports and the 3 Counties, simply because we are evolving in to this mega region. We are a large statistical Metropolitan area and I just see that at some point the fact that we are boundaried on the West by the Everglades and the East by the Atlantic Ocean, the way those areas develop – and I do not think it will happen by 2012, but it will end up at some point with those 3 Airports and those 3 Seaports being a part of the same governmental entity. It may be 10 years from now maybe 20 years from now, it's not in my short range vision. I think it will eventually happen because of all the dynamics that are going on in South Florida.

So, what we really focused on is how we start to develop what we call the lineman approach to what we want to be when we grow up. We started identifying with Mel's help those areas where there are redundancies or duplication between the Airport and the Seaport. We started having them think about the ways in which their entities do the same things. I will share with you one of the first discussions which had to do with combining their legal departments and their leasing departments. Irv was on that subcommittee; and over time this actually identified 8 areas where they would benefit by combining their operations that is an area for you to look at. I know you recommended that the Airport and the Seaport come under the Board of County Commissioners. It is not unusual in fact if you think of a large corporation. In most cases they have CEO who answers to a Board of Directors. The Airport and the Seaport are two giant economic engines. If they were to report directly to the Board of County Commissioners it would follow a model that is very common in business. Whether there is no one intermediary, you're reporting to a Board and we would become the Board of Directors of those enterprise funds. But again, it follows up where we talked about where there were areas – I believe the Security recommendation is being implemented in this budget cycle were the same. BSO would be one unit for both the Airport and the Seaport not 2 separate units as well. We looked at our form of government and we felt that our job was to look at efficiencies not at structure, but we did have some discussions about structure. The last Charter Review Board looked at the position of Mayor and said

when do we want to see our Mayor; that identified the times you want to see the Mayor and that is in the current Charter. You might look at responsibilities in the office of the Mayor. I think that the Mayor should be the person on the economic development committee. When people come to Broward County they want to be able to know whether the County would be receptive; granted it is a 9 member Board of County Commissioners, and you need to have a majority vote; the Mayor is the most appropriate person to meet and greet that business. Find out what the key terms are and match them up to see if there is going to be a marriage there, then bring it forward to the Board.

As far as models of government go, there are probably as many models as there are governments. In Monroe County, they elect a Mayor every year from one of their members. They do that because they can serve for more than 1 year. **Miami-Dade County now has a separate role like??** The Mayor originally was a Legislative Mayor and recently became a Strong Mayor. If you read the recent stories in the paper – you've got to be real careful with a Strong Mayor. The reason is that the Legislature imposed budget cuts on all local government entities. The Mayor refused to send his staff to work with the City Commission in Miami-Dade County. This does not go well with a cooperative government, when one arm of government thinks he does not have to work with the other arm of government and that's truly what you have.

I know both Mayors and the members of the Orange County Commission; I am the second Vice President of the Florida Associations of Counties. Teresa Jacobs is our current President, and I would tell you that it is not a smooth sailing affair. Their Board took a position opposing the tax cuts and the Mayor took the position of supporting the tax cuts; it did not lead to a friendly discussion. When we first did the 9 Single-member districts, it was not my first choice; it was a choice that would pass. I looked at the School Board model with the 7 and the 2 and I felt there were some problems with that. If I had my druthers, my ultimate choice is a 5, 4. If you had 4 At-large members and 5 Single-members districts you would always be able to build a consensus in every district because you would have 4 people that were elected At-large. Does that allow us to have representation on the Board for diversity issues? I do not know, I would have to look at the demographics? There is more than issues to changing a form of government. If you need a point person there are many ways to get one. You have to make sure by getting your point person; you are not alienating the very issues that are core to what we celebrate in this community; which is all inclusive in being able to elect a number of people who reflect the diversity in our community. So, it is not a snap judgment that anybody can make. I don't know and I apologize to all of you because I don't know how much time you spent and I am sorry for being late today.

Ms. Eisinger thanked Mayor Eggelation and Commissioner Lieberman for their great viewpoints.

The Chair asked the subcommittee for any comments on the Proposed Regionalism Policy Statement.

Ms. Weeks MOTIONED, Ms. Eisinger SECONDED and the motion passed unanimously to approve Mr. Buckner changes to the Proposed Regionalism Policy Statement which were to fix the word “an” to “and” and to change the word “its” to the word “County” .

Mr. Weiss MOTIONED to amend section 2.04A to include an item which represents the County with respect to Economic Development issues and the motion passed unanimously, SECONDED by Ms. Rogers and the motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment

Phyllis King – Plantation, FL

Mrs. King: I have been a resident of Broward County for more than 20 years and I’ve watched while the County Commission made a valiant decision over the Airport. That was a very tough fight and I had never seen anything like it. That decision will make such a big difference in my children’s lives and the future of Broward County. From what I see this Committee doing and the decisions that this Committee makes are for the future and it is very important. I just want to say that you guys are doing a wonderful job and it is truly an honor to be here and a part of the process.

V. Adjournment

There being no further business or public comment the meeting was adjourned at 6:57 p.m. The minutes of this meeting are recorded on CRC-AGSC CD # 8.30.07 (BCGV CTR).